

if has anybody has ever been sick, if anybody ever been found to be sick, not one person has ever gotten sick by purchasing medications, name brand medications, from Canada.

The second argument that the industry puts out is somehow it will affect the research and development for new medications. The fact is the taxpayers, through the National Institutes of Health, have funded research into pharmaceutical drugs for \$27 billion a year. Second, they write off all their R&D investment and the taxpayers cover for them.

In my view, the taxpayers have been tremendously generous to the industry and to the development of new drugs and that all the new drugs, if we take a look at cancer, AIDS drugs, other types of medications, they have all been funded by taxpayer-paid research. So first the strawman made the argument about safety. In fact, the legislation we passed here in the House improved the safety by dealing with counterfeit.

Another issue is that somehow it impacts the development of new medication, life-saving medications. The fact is it does not touch it. I think we will maintain the tax credit for research and development, and we will continue to fund the National Institutes of Health to the tune of \$27 billion, and the taxpayers have been quite generous. In fact, what they are owed is a return on their investment.

So what I believe, and would hope that others have seen this article and know what they are having in their own district and as the conference meets here on the prescription drug bill, is that any piece of legislation that does not deal with price does not deal with the primary issue affecting the senior community and that we have an obligation to get them the best price and get the taxpayers the best price we can get them through a prescription drug bill that allows the free market to work. Because for too long we have had a closed market here. We need to open up the market and allow the principle of competition to work.

Second, and I think in addition to that, is that we talk about expanding Medicare. We need to ensure that for that \$400 billion we get the most for our money. Everybody today knows if they go to any senior center and talk to folks they will tell them, because there is somebody from their senior home who has gone over the border, gone into Canada and bought prescriptions filled out for everybody in the unit or everybody at the housing project, they have bought medications. We have turned our grandparents into drug runners, and that should not be illegal because what they are trying to do is meet the obligations they have for their own health.

For too long we have all heard stories of people who have cut medications in half, skipped a month so their spouse can get the medications they need. That is a health and safety risk.

This legislation that was passed out of this Congress with bipartisan majority would address that health and safety risk. It would address the need of our taxpayers who are more than willing to help get a prescription drug bill but not do it when we are paying inflated prices, sometimes as high as 60 percent, to the pharmaceutical industry. If someone takes one medication like Tamoxifen, which costs \$360 here in the United States, it fights what? Breast cancer. In Canada, it costs \$33.62. That is the difference, and it means life or death for a lot of the people here in this country.

I call on the conference to quickly pass a prescription drug bill that has this reimportation provision and ask that my colleagues look at the article the other day in USA Today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S STEEL POLICY IS WORKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of President Bush's steel policy which was implemented in March, 2002, to provide the domestic steel industry with a 3-year safeguard program against a crushing surge of steel imports that had begun in 1998.

As chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus, I have seen firsthand and heard testimony from many steel employers on the extent of the economic devastation that the industry suffered as a result of the import surge. In my view, President Bush took the courageous position to stand up for the steel industry and acted to help restore the steel industry to its competitive footing, something that, unfortunately, the previous administration had not chosen to do.

On September 19, the International Trade Commission issued a mid-term review of the 201 safeguard, which confirmed what many of us had predicted for some time, that President Bush's steel policy is working and showing substantial results. In short, the ITC mid-term review of the President's steel policy is a win for the administration and a win for steel employers and workers.

Since 2002, we have seen the domestic industry begin a heroic recovery and restructuring of the industry and groundbreaking new labor agreements. Yet critics of the steel program argue that steel consumers have unduly suffered from the tariffs imposed on se-

lected imports, and they have clamored for the elimination of the President's program. In my view, the ITC report quells those critics' voices and shows, demonstrating very clearly, that the section 201 safeguard has had minimal impact on the steel-consuming industries.

The ITC report reveals that the domestic steel industry has been doing the right things to get their companies into top shape so they could compete globally. Steel prices have stabilized at a sustainable level after an initial price spike immediately following the implementation of tariffs. This reaffirms the administration's policy and their decision to allow numerous exemptions from the tariff structure.

Serious attempts to restructure, reach groundbreaking agreements between management and labor and significant capital investments have been taken by industry, but, frankly, they cannot stop there. The 201 safeguard program must remain in place for the full 3 years and allow the industry to finish what it has begun and truly recover from devastating import surges.

Mr. Speaker, this really boils down to jobs. The 201 safeguard has stopped the hemorrhaging of jobs among steel producers, and the ITC report found that steel-consuming jobs have not been put at risk by this policy.

Since this most recent crisis in the steel sector began, over 54,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs and over 30 steel companies have had to close their doors.

We developed trade remedy laws like the 201 safeguard specifically to help our companies endure unfair import surges like the one that caused this crisis in the steel industry. We must not allow unfair foreign trade to push our steelworkers out of jobs and force more and more of our good-paying jobs offshore.

I am pleased that the ITC found at core that President Bush's steel policy is good for the industry, it is good for America, and it is good for America's industrial base. We must remain vigilant and police our markets for the sake of our steel industry, manufacturers, and the entire American economy.

I want to thank President Bush for standing up for steel, and I urge him to stick with it.

#### FUNDING FOR IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, next week the Congress will consider the President's request that we borrow \$87 billion and indebt the American people for the next 30 years to repay that 87 billion borrowed dollars on top of the \$79 billion that Congress borrowed last April to continue the actions in Iraq and build that country. And I say "build" because the President has asked for \$20.3 billion to build Iraq, not

rebuild. We are not talking about war damage. That is a tiny fraction of the cost. This is a guide to the gold-plated construction and war profiteering that the administration has put forward for Iraq.

There is no sum too great. Six billion dollars, not to repair the damage to their electrical grid but to update their 1950s and 1960s boilers and generators to 2003 standards and all the other disinvestments. Six billion dollars the American taxpayers will be asked to borrow to give them the state-of-the-art energy grid when lights are blinking out in this country and our rates are going up.

No idea is too tangential. The Bush Administration wishes the Iraqis to have wireless Internet. They did not have it before the war. I do not think they even had laptops. Maybe a few of the elite did. But they are going to have it after the war. They are going to have wireless Internet paid for, money borrowed, in the name of the American taxpayer.

And then, finally, nothing is too wasteful when it comes to this administration. Mr. Bremer, the pro-consul, signed a contract to feed the 25 members of the Iraqi Governing Council handpicked by Mr. Bremer and the President for a mere \$5,000 per day.

□ 1830

Apparently the food was going to be flown in on an executive jet from some exclusive restaurant in Washington, DC or New York. I do not know how they could spend \$5,000 a day for 25 people. The Iraqi Council canceled that and generally said, "You know, when it comes to reconstruction or feeding ourselves or doing all these other things, help us do it, and we can do it for 10 cents on the dollar." They are aghast at what we are wasting.

The major point is when it comes to this administration, no sum is too much when it comes to war profiteering and gold-plated construction in Iraq. But it is too easy for them to neglect our troops.

We find out that 30,000 of our troops lack body armor. They have been issued flak vests from the Vietnam era. It will not stop an AK-47 bullet. It would cost \$15 million to equip those troops with vests, but the Pentagon, which got \$79 billion last spring to equip the troops in the war and had a budget of nearly \$400 billion last year, said it could not find within that budget, \$15 million to give our young men and women those vests. So now, in order to equip those young men and women with the vests they should have had before they went there, they are asking for \$300 million. What is this? Yes, \$15 million worth of vests are needed, and the Pentagon said they want a \$300 million appropriation to do that.

But it does not stop there. Some of our troops are over there in their jungle fatigues. Many of them are driving Humvees that have either canvas side

curtains or sheet metal doors, which do not do real well with AK-47 bullets or rocket-propelled grenades. Now, they finally came to the conclusion that we should buy some armored Humvees for those troops.

The boots, the substandard boots they purchased are wearing out. Some of the troops are wearing jungle fatigues. We cannot afford those desert fatigues for everybody. A \$400 billion budget, \$79 billion last spring, another \$79 billion now. Some of those people are going to have to go over there in their jungle fatigues, wear that Vietnam era flak jacket, drive around in Humvees with canvas side curtains.

But yesterday the Bush administration decided they are going to get this all right and fix it. So they appointed Condoleezza Rice to oversee Mr. Bremer, the pro-consul in Iraq, and see if they can do these things better in the future.

I have a suggestion for Pro-Consul Bremer and his overseer, Ms. Rice: Why do not they go over there, looking like a target, wearing jungle fatigues, and wear a Vietnam era flak jacket and drive a Humvee with canvas side curtains, instead of going around in their armor-plated Suburbans, surrounded by Bradley Fighting Vehicles with helicopters overhead, and they say they have been there and are doing what the troops need.

The troops are not getting what they need, and we are wasting billions to rebuild that country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FEENEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### LETTERS FROM HOME REGARDING IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 165 years ago, conservatives in the House of Representatives passed a rule to pro-

hibit and ban the discussion of the debate of slavery in the House of Representatives. Then Congressman, former President, John Quincy Adams, strongly objecting to that policy passed by the conservatives that ran this House of Representatives, came to the floor night after night, week after week, disputing that rule and reading letters from his constituents, mostly women in Massachusetts, who could not vote, sharing letters from his constituents with the House of Representatives and with the American people protesting that prohibition on that debate.

Today, the Congress is considering other very important legislation, other legislation and investigations, something the House of Representatives conservative leadership does not want to allow, and that is debate on how this \$87 billion will be spent and accounted for, whether or not the Bush administration told the truth when leading this Congress and country into war with Iraq and how we are going to take care of the troops.

I am again tonight, as I have night after night since late July, reading letters from my constituents, because conservative Republican leadership in this House will not allow us to debate these issues and will not do the investigation that the country and so many of my constituents are demanding. I am reading letters from them tonight about the troops, about the lack of accountability on the \$87 billion and the \$1 billion a week we are already spending.

Jane from Akron, Ohio, writes, "Do not put good money after bad. I implore you to look at the U.S. servicemen and women in Iraq and Afghanistan and see that they are treated decently in terms of danger pay, education for their dependents and family support issues. The Bush administration is certainly not supporting the troops with decency and respect."

She is talking about some of the same things my friend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) just talked about.

Evelyn from Akron, Ohio, writes, "This administration has bankrupted the country. Please vote against the \$87 billion unless the people responsible are held accountable."

She talks about, as many other letters have, the fact that we are spending \$1 billion a week in Iraq. One-third of that money has gone to private contractors, many of them unbid contracts. The largest contract has gone to the Halliburton company, which Vice President DICK CHENEY was CEO of until he was running for Vice President, and she and others talk about the fact that Mr. CHENEY is still receiving \$13,000 every month from Halliburton, as Halliburton is receiving hundreds of millions in unbid contracts, hundreds of millions of our tax dollars.

Wes of Strongsville, Ohio, writes, "It is beyond belief that this administration has gone so long, nearly 5 months